

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 stand in the present application, claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 18 and 19 having been amended. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. As noted above, claims 9, 18 and 19 have been amended to correct the deficiencies noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, the Examiner's § 101 rejection of these claims is believed to have been overcome.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 8-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As noted above, Applicants have amended claims 9 and 12 and is therefore believed to have overcome the Examiner's § 112, first paragraph, rejection of these claims.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. As noted above, Applicants have amended claims 1, 18 and 19 and these amendments are also believed to overcome the Examiner's § 112, second paragraph, rejection of the claims.

The Examiner has also rejected all of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cho et al., U.S. Patent 6,741,986 (hereinafter "Cho"). In view of the above-described claim amendments, the Examiner's § 102 rejection of the claims is believed to have been overcome, as will be described in greater detail below.

Cho does not allow a plurality of users to make amendments/corrections, and for those amendments to be scored, as required by independent claims 1 and 9 and all of

their respective dependent claims. In Cho, one person, an "extractor", prepares an extract from an original article, and the extract is then assessed by another person (a "reviewer"). This reviewer generates an error count which is used to rate the extractor's performance (column 18). The foot of column 17 states that the reviewer can correct the errors. Individuals may be qualified as both extractors and reviewers (col. 18 line 19). However, only the original extract is scored, and not the amendments, as is required by the present, i.e., claims "moderation inputs relating to such amendments." The extractor's performance rating is used only to determine his remuneration, column 3 lines 3-5, or his suitability to become a reviewer.

It is assumed in Cho that the amendments, actually the corrections, are an improvement on the original. This is a reasonable assumption in the situation envisaged by Cho, of a supervisor reviewing an extractor's work. However, in a rolling program of development of an ontology as envisaged in Applicants' invention, amendments may be proposed by any user, and have to be accepted by several other users. The idea of an ongoing updating process, in which data is continuously amended and the amendments scored, is simply not disclosed or even suggested in Cho. Nor is the idea of allowing different users to amend the same data – in Cho each extract is assessed by just one reviewer.

To further highlight these distinctions, Applicants have incorporated some of the features of claim 4 into claim 1 so that claim 1 further comprises "means for generating a user moderation value for each user of the system in respect of inputs" Similarly, some of the features of claim 12 have been incorporated into claim 9, to require "generating a moderation value from moderation inputs of other users made in respect

THOMPSON et al
Appl. No. 10/784,919
June 21, 2007

of amendments made by the user, and applied to inputs made by that user."

These features are described, for example, on page 8 line 20-23, page 9 line 23-25, and line 33-35. Again, there is simply no reference in Cho to the scoring of contributors on the basis of past work affecting their further contributions. So the amended independent claims 1 and 9, and their respective dependent claims, now more clearly patentably define over Cho.

Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all of claims 1-19, standing in the application, be allowed and that the case be passed to issue. If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a supplemental response or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone exchange indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:


Chris Comuntzis
Reg. No. 31,097

CC:lmr
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100